

ENTERED

August 15, 2025

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

JOHNNY R. JONES,	§	CIVIL ACTION No
Plaintiff,	§	4:23-cv-04053
	§	
	§	
vs.	§	JUDGE CHARLES ESKRIDGE
	§	
	§	
COMMISSIONER OF	§	
THE SOCIAL	§	
SECURITY	§	
ADMINISTRATION,	§	
Defendant.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING
MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff Johnny R. Jones filed an action under the Social Security Act, 42 USC §§405(g) & 1383(c), for review of a final decision by the Commissioner denying his request for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security benefits. Dkt 1. The matter was referred for disposition to Magistrate Judge Christina Bryan. Dkt 3.

Plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment in support of his claim. Dkts 8 & 9. Judge Bryan issued a Memorandum and Recommendation, recommending that (i) Plaintiff's motion be granted, (ii) the Commissioner's cross-motion be denied, and (iii) this case be remanded for further proceedings. Dkt 14. That recommendation was adopted, and this case was remanded to the Commissioner on April 29, 2025. Dkt 15.

Plaintiff then filed an unopposed motion for attorney fees and costs pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act. Dkt 16. Pending is a Memorandum and Recommendation by Judge Bryan, recommending that the motion be granted

in the amount of \$7,840.00 for attorney fees and \$402.00 in costs. Dkt 17.

The district court reviews *de novo* those conclusions of a magistrate judge to which a party has specifically objected. See FRCP 72(b)(3) & 28 USC §636(b)(1)(C); see also *United States v Wilson*, 864 F2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir 1989, *per curiam*). The district court may accept any other portions to which there's no objection if satisfied that no clear error appears on the face of the record. See *Guillory v PPG Industries Inc*, 434 F3d 303, 308 (5th Cir 2005), citing *Douglass v United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir 1996, *en banc*); see also FRCP 72(b) advisory committee note (1983).

No party filed objections. No clear error otherwise appears upon review and consideration of the Memoranda and Recommendations, the record, and the applicable law.

The Memorandum and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED as the Memorandum and Order of this Court. Dkt 17.


The unopposed motion by Plaintiff for attorney fees and costs is GRANTED. Dkt 16.

Pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act, Plaintiff is AWARDED attorney fees in the amount of \$7,840.00 and costs in the amount of \$402.00.

This is a FINAL JUDGMENT.

SO ORDERED.

Signed on August 15, 2025 at Houston, Texas.



Hon. Charles Eskridge
United States District Judge